DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 747 EA 024 208

AUTHOR Keedy, John L.
TITLE Teacher Facilitator Leadership and School Organization Mediational Effects: Implications on Work Redesign for Instructional Supervisors.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Collegiality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; Leadership Qualities; *Professional Development; Supervisors; *Supervisory Methods; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Role; *Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study that examined facilitator leadership in three teacher collegial groups (TCGs) and the effect of school organization on facilitator leadership behaviors are presented in this paper. The teacher work redesign program was implemented in a rural Georgian school district to enhance teacher independence and empowerment. Methodology involved field observation; a survey of all TCG participants in three schools, which elicited an 88 percent response rate; and interviews with three participants from each school--the TCG facilitator, the principal, and one TCG member. Findings indicate that teacher work redesign implies the following role changes for supervisors and teachers: (1) supervisors, as networkers, can achieve more efficient teacher supervision; and (2) teachers can act as peer observers, mentors, and staff developers. However, TCGs did not lead to teacher reflection or longterm professional growth. The lack of program impact could be due to its 1-year duration and the embedded characteristics of the teaching profession. Six tables are included. Appendices contain information on the TCG meeting format, the survey and findings, an assessment of teachers' year-long focus and meeting game plans, the interview guide, and field observation notes. (Contains 37 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED348747

Teacher Facilitator Leadership and School Organization

Mediational Effects: Implications on Work

Redesign for Instructional Supervisors

John L. Keedy

West Georgia College

Carrollton, GA 3018-0001

404-836-6557

FAX: 404-836-6729

Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the

American Educational Research Association, San Francisco

April 24, 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Keedy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

EA 024 208

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The year 1986 was a watershed year for school reform (Murphy, 1990). School reformers in three national reports (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes, 1986; National Governors' Association, 1986) questioned whether state-mandated reforms could fundamentally change and improve schooling. Teachers were no longer viewed as the problem (whose teaching could be improved by state evaluation instruments and more rigorous pre-service testing), but instead were seen as the potential solution to school reform. The Carnegie Forum authors, for instance, advocated increasing the professionalism of the teacher corps by empowering teachers to have major influence on their workplaces. Fostering greater professionalism within the existing teacher corps includes upgrading the quality of the work environment, increasing collegial interaction, and redistributing authority from the administration to teachers (Murphy, 1990).

One strategy reformers increasingly advocate is teacher work redesign (Hart, 1990). Teacher work redesign is the "deliberate, purposeful planning of the job, including any or all of its structural or social aspects" (Umsot, Bell, & Mitchell cited by Hart, 1990). In this paper teacher work redesign is explored by reporting field study results of: 1) facilitator leadership in three teacher collegial groups, and 2) the effect of organization mediation upon facilitator leadership behaviors.

An Exploration of Teacher Work Redesign

A key ingredient in school restructuring is the redefinition of roles and responsibilities of professional staff (Murphy 1992). Work redesign as a restructuring strategy emphasizes interdependence and cooperative work teams providing opportunities for teachers and administrators to deal with various problems (Clark & Meloy, 1989).

Teacher Work Redesign (TWR) seeks to empower teachers and help them develop an internalized locus of control (Frymier, 1987). According to Murphy (1992) TWR is based on several premises. Teaching is a moral activity and should be controlled by teachers themselves (Angus, 1988; Bolin, 1989). Second, because

teachers are intellectuals, they should lead discussions about the nature and purposes of schooling (Giroux, 1988). Third, teaching is a profession and should be guided by professional canons and not bureaucratic regulations (Wise, 1989).

TWR has an implication for the emerging definition of leadership. Leadership should not be based on position and role incumbency (Maccoby, 1988) but distributed throughout the organization (Sergiovanni, 1989). Leadership is better connected to expertise than to line authority (Heifetz, 1988). TWR and developing teacher leadership, in effect, may be inseparable processes. Smylie and Denny (1990) cite several authors in specifying three objectives for teacher leadership: 1) enhancing the professional status of teachers; 2) tapping local expertise applicable to teacher professional learning and school improvement; and 3) recognizing and supporting local autonomy vital to improving teachers' work with students.

Other reformers have advocated changing relationships among teachers. Lieberman (1988) advocated building colleagueship among teachers, who historically have been isolated from one another. As colleagues teachers can share common problems and collective solutions, help engineer a school structure permitting autonomy, flexibility, responsibility, and provide resources for teaching and learning. Lambert (1989) concluded that teachers must be involved in opportunities to inquire, criticize, and participate in the process of empowering the learner. Teachers like other professionals need opportunities to engage and practice collegiality and shared leadership by engaging their peers in a professional culture offering choice, responsibility, and authority.

TWR can be used to change teacher relationships by expanding traditional teacher roles to include mentoring and peer supervision, evaluating principals work, providing staff development, assessing student learning, and developing school curricula (Corcoran, 1989; McCarthey & Peterson, 1989; Moore-Johnson, 1988, 1989). In short, teachers' work must be reconceptualized and supported by organizational structures to break down classroom isolation (Bredeson, 1989) and encourage

"collegial interaction around the problems of practice" (Elmore, 1989, p. 23; cited by Murphy, 1992).

Although TWR seems an excellent vehicle to make the teaching profession a more desirable career through incentives and participatory structures, current research has mixed results about its success. Smylie and Denny (1990) cite two reasons for their contention that creating more effective teacher leadership involves far more than appointing and "anointing" new positions for teacher leadership. First, teachers assuming new leadership positions define new work roles by adjusting to the tensions and ambiguities of their workplace demands. Some colleagues may resist new work roles and instead reshape roles to meet their own needs, knowledge, and skills (Nicholson, 1984). What teachers do in their redesigned roles often was far different from what they should do.

Second, leadership is a function of bidirectional interactions and negotiations between positional leaders and other organization participants. A teacher in a designated leadership position (e.g., instructional lead teacher) not only *influences* others because of positional authority and expertise, but also *is influenced* by structural and cultural organization dimensions which may support or restrain the development and exercise of leadership. Smylie and Denny (1990) found that teacher leadership roles were mediated by the organizational contexts in which they were established. Organization mediation, according to these authors, has three dimensions: structural (release time, availability of substitutes and quiet, professional meeting places), normative (sub-group norms and school-wide norms), and political (are teachers in redesigned positions "backed" by their principals?).

Of these three dimensions the normative might have the most potential for mediational effect and subsequent maintenance of the status quo. The traditional teacher norms, equality, autonomy, and privacy, (Lortie, 1975; Rosenholz, 1989 cited in Smylie and Denny, 1990) define rights and obligations among teachers and between teachers and administrators. These norms often are capable of countering job

descriptions of redesigned teacher roles. Hart (1990) compared career ladder implementations in two high schools and concluded that the school social unit outweighed the efforts of individual teachers and the new formal work structure to redesign work in these schools. School social units can mitigate the very best intentions of teacher work redesign.

The Research Questions and Study Assumptions

In this study the concept of TWR was examined in the context of teacher leadership exhibited in teacher collegial groups (TCGs). Appendix A contains the definition, meeting format and the six-step presentation procedure of TCGs.

Two questions were asked: First, *How effective was the leadership of the three TCG facilitators?* Four criteria defined "effectiveness". Facilitators should: 1) provide technical support to TCG members; 2) maintain a task orientation so members follow the presentation procedure; 3) provide logistical support for TCG members, e.g., scheduling for peer observation; handouts; networking with teachers; and 4) encourage an empathic, growth-oriented meeting environment. TCG meeting outcomes (teacher self-reports: teacher year-long foci and meeting-to-meeting gameplans; and percentage of meetings teachers formulated specific gameplans) also were used to measure successful leadership. Presumably, successful or unsuccessful facilitator behaviors should be reflected in the quality of these documents and teacher ability to formulate gameplans.

The second question was: *What were the organization mediation effects upon the three facilitators' successful or unsuccessful leadership?* Presumably, organization effects mediate, i.e., influence, leadership intentions and efforts. The norms of equality, autonomy, and privacy characterize the teaching profession. Teachers share equal professional status, possess rights to make independent professional judgments, and share obligations to maintain such status and rights. Consequently, conversations about classroom practice are rarely engaged in; teachers claim they want additional roles and responsibilities but they do not like

being different from other teachers. The result is role ambiguity and a prevailing tendency for teachers not to assume roles challenging prevailing beliefs and practices. This question examined how traditional teacher norms affected teacher facilitator leadership within the TCGs and how teacher leadership was mediated by school-wide organizational factors?

This study poses two litmus tests for TWR. Teachers should be able to practice successful group facilitator leadership in collegial structures such as TCGs. Second, strong facilitator leadership should compensate for organization mediation effects (including traditional teaching norms).

Study Background

Three TCGs were chosen out of the eight TCGs used by the school system during 1989-90 and 1990-91. Release time (12:30 -3:30) was provided for the nine TCG meetings instead of having the meetings after school when teachers would be tired from their normal teaching duties. This provision indicated a major commitment of time and resources in a rural county of 13,000 students in west Georgia.

A workshop for the TCG facilitators was conducted in August of both 1989 and 1990 on the TCG meeting format, the six-step process of teacher presentation of classroom research, and sample year-long foci and gameplans. The workshop leader particularly stressed the importance of TCG members: a) identifying a practical, achievable year long focus (YLF); b) formulating workable meeting-to-meeting gameplans (MMG); c) trying out MMGs at in their classrooms at least three times; and d) collecting information describing how well each gameplan played out in the classroom.

Methodology

As an interpretive study, individuals were assumed to construct their own social reality ("insider perceptions"), rather than having objective reality determine individual perceptions (Erickson, 1986; Gage, 1988). Open-ended interview questions were

asked rather than questions structured on preexisting hypotheses. Data collected according to qualitative research guidelines for grounded theory research (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) were generated and scrutinized inductively (constant comparative analysis). Several data sets were analyzed for "congruency of fit" (Marshall, 1985). Emerging case themes were grounded in the data themselves (Blase, 1990).

Case themes were then analyzed across-case (comparative case study; Hart, 1990) for common patterns, or abstractions (Merriam, 1984). These abstractions were bases for a theoretic discussion (implications based on the existing research and professional literature; Blase, 1990; Yin, 1984).

Data Collection and Analysis

Research Question 1: Facilitator leadership

Data were collected through field observation, survey, and interview. Participant year-long foci and gameplans also were assessed and examined as teacher self-report data.

Field Observation. The researcher used the focused observation technique in which as many data were recorded as possible on facilitator and TCG member interactions. Did the facilitator help "set" a task orientation and professional environment? Did members exhibit expected TCG behaviors, e.g., critiquing, providing information on MMGs?

Survey. The survey instrument items were based on the expectations for TCG facilitators specified at the training workshops preceding the TCG program. Surveys were distributed (anonymously) to all TCG participants (return rate: 88%). Appendix B contains the survey items and data. Survey questions were clustered to approximate the four criteria of facilitator effectiveness. Data from questions 1-3 were analyzed as defining technical support; data from questions 4-6 defined task orientation; data from questions 7 and 9 addressed providing a professional environment; and question 8 data addressed the facilitator's provision of logistical support. (Questions 10 and 11 were combined with teacher self-report data as TCG outcomes. See Analysis

subsection below).

Interview. Three study participants (the principal, facilitator, and one TCG member--selected by the researcher for objectivity and perceptiveness) were interviewed in the conversational format (Patton, 1980). The researcher asked one open-ended question: What did this TCG facilitator do in exercising group leadership (or lack thereof)? The interviewer, when necessary, cued responses by reviewing TCG leadership criteria specified above. The interview data were reported and compared within each TCG group for common patterns.

Teacher Self-Report Data. Participants completed forms on which they recorded their YLFs and MMGs. These descriptive data were assessed by a panel of experts: three education professors. A YLF satisfying the criterion of *focus* would be reasonably achievable within approximately half a year, and defined narrowly enough to have specification yet broad enough to be "broken down" into eight gameplans. MMG assessment criteria were *appropriateness* and *professional growth*. For appropriateness assessors coded MMGs analyzed as relating to accomplishing the YLF with an "A" and conversely MMGs not relating to the YLF were coded with an "I". These data were reported as ratios (appropriate MMGs to inappropriate MMGs, e.g., 7:1).

For professional growth assessors used a 10-1 continuum: a "10" when the gameplans analyzed as a group implied professional accomplishment (a cohesive pattern of progress towards the YLF with gameplans becoming more challenging), and a "1" when the gameplans implied virtually no instructional improvement (i.e., a teacher merely going through the motions of following procedures with no noticeable growth).

Assessor mean responses were tabulated for each TCG group. Appendix C contains these data for the three TCGs. A synopsis of these data are included in the Results section.

Analysis. Two analysis steps were made. First, comparative content analysis

(Weber, 1985) was used to examine these four data sets for congruency on the four criteria for effective facilitator leadership: technical, task orientation, logistical, and professional environment. Second, these patterns were compared with TCG outcomes: assessments of YLF and MMGs; and data from survey questions 10 and 11. Presumably, successful facilitator leadership would result in TCG colleagues assessing each presenter's progress and presenters formulating specific gameplans (Steps 4 and 6, respectively, in the TCG six-step presentation).

Research Question 2: Organization Mediation on Facilitator's Leadership

The principal, facilitator, and one TCG member responded to the four questions indexed to the literature on organization mediation (see Appendix D). Study participant responses were recorded as raw data on prepared forms. Synopses consisting of key phrases were tabulated and facilitator, teacher, and principal perspectives were analyzed for common patterns. Procedurally, data from questions 2 and 3 (traditional teaching norms and school-wide mediation factors) provided the context for perceptions of each facilitator's role. Question 4 (implications for TWR) were used in the Implications section of this study.

Results

Berry Primary School

Leadership

Field Observation. Appendix E contains the data; a synopsis specific to Mary's TCG leadership follows. Mary exhibited behaviors encouraging TCG participants to examine and assess their gameplans: distributing packets containing all YLFs and MMGs; and asking questions both to cue participants that the next presentation step might be appropriate and to share in the collegial conversation (TCG presentation steps 4 and 5). Both presenters were observed as formulating their next meeting gameplan based on their colleagues' assessment of information presented on the previous gameplan.

Survey Data. Mary provided the technical guidance (questions 1-3) and

structured the meeting format (questions 4-6). She provided both a professional environment (questions 7 and 9) and logistical support (question 8).

Perceptions of Facilitator Leadership. Table 1 contains interview data.

Place Table 1 about here

TCG Outcomes. Based on survey questions 10 and 11, teachers believed they both formulated specific MMGs and provided each other with collegial assessment (TCG step 5) for progress toward their YLFs (questions 10 and 11). Data in Appendix C confirmed Mary's success with keeping her colleagues focused: YLFs had reasonable tight scope and evidence of reflective practice (consensus= F-R for all participants); ratio for gameplans appropriate to YLF were 7:1. Professional growth index (6.6) was highest of three groups.

Analysis. Mary exhibited effective leadership behaviors. She provided technical support (provided YLF and MMG packets for TCG members, reviewed format steps, differentiated YLF from MMG, distributed articles on various YLF); logistical support (substitute teaching; peer observation); helped establish a spirit of inquiry (modeling cuing questions and questions requiring participants to explain why a gameplan worked or otherwise); and set an empathic environment in which self-assessment and collegial assessment of progress (TCG step 4) were accepted. The TCG product, i.e., YLF and MMG assessments; and percentage of occasions when teachers formulated gameplans, generally confirmed this success.

Table 1

Perceptions of Facilitator Leadership: BPS (1989-90)

What did this TCG facilitator do in exercising group leadership (or lack thereof)?

*[F] Mary promoted a relaxed atmosphere of verbal exchange, moved meetings along if one colleague monopolized conversation, provided updated printouts of YLF and MMG for each presenter, and scheduled peer observations.

**[T] Mary was clear from the beginning regarding group mutual needs for input, and research and sharing to meet TCG goals. She asked probing questions (e.g., why was your gameplan unsuccessful?); "She just never let go" [about why a gameplan did not work]. She established a spirit of inquiry, listed YLFs and MMGs for each meeting, distributed articles about YLFs, and did first article critique (to show teachers how to do it). [See meeting format in Appendix A].

***[P] Mary exhibited strong communication skills as our instructional lead teacher; "Did lots of leg work" [logistics for peer observation; would even substitute in classrooms, if necessary].

---

* F= facilitator

** T= teacher interviewee

***P= principal

Organization Mediation

Table 2 contains these data.

Place Table 2 about here

Analysis. Mary's role was analyzed as setting the TCG structure (meeting format and the six-step presentation) first and then playing the peer support role. Traditional teacher norms did not have a negative effect on her role--largely due to organization context of Mary's position. Mary's title, instructional lead teacher (ILT), was an advantage. Since Mary, who taught part-time, was new to BPS, she had to establish her role as a supporter of teachers (Mary: "I was pro-teacher"). According to the principal, the TCG could have "made or broken her"--given the above context. The behaviors Mary exhibited, e.g., substituting herself when TAs were out, might have reflected this extra incentive for Mary.

Organization mediation factors were analyzed as positive. The principal's behaviors and intentions supported the TCG. The principal had seen the TCG work before in her previous school (1988-89), and knew how to coax the project along, e.g., talking this program up at a school-wide faculty meeting. Mary's circumstances (see above) also mediated the facilitator's role favorably.

The three study participants perceived this TCG as a vehicle for teacher work redesign, largely as encouraging the teacher communication-cooperative planning-school improvement cycle. Second, the 1989-90 TCG provided leadership continuity for the next year's TCG, since two of its members became co-facilitators for the 1990-91 TCG.

Table 2

Perceptions of Organizational Mediation: BPS (1989-90)

---

1) Perceptions of TCG facilitator's role?

[F] "I began as timekeeper and director; by fifth meeting, TCG [presentation] process would have run by itself (with possible exception of one teacher with a tendency to monopolize conversation)."

[T] Mary kept teachers on track by saying "we've got to move on"; she helped teachers be critical listeners [because they had limited time to give suggestions].

[P] Mary was seen as a peer, support person (not as an administrator) for teachers to improve themselves without the threat of state-mandated evaluation.

---

2) How did traditional norms about teaching (equality, autonomy, privacy) mediate the TCG facilitator effectiveness?

[F] "I had to work hard to establish trust [because new to school]"; "presented myself as a peer" ("pro-teacher"); job title (Instructional lead teacher, ILT) helped in a large school of 50 teachers.

[T] The title of ILT helped; she was visible in classrooms helping teachers

[P] "It never entered teachers' minds that Mary would evaluate them because she viewed these teachers as successful and competent."

---

3) What school-wide structural factors (if any) mediated the TCG facilitator success?

[F] Principal had investment from last year (when she had started a TCG at previous school); substitutes not a problem because teacher assistants (TA) were available and other teachers would release their TAs (if a teacher's TA was absent); TCGs had a good reputation and were talked up by TCG peers.

[T] "The principal brought in the TCG"; also both principal and ILT were new to BPS this year and "everything was up for grabs because no one knew what to expect (e.g., we started empowering our TAs; unlike previous years, TAs now could conduct classes on their own)".

[P] "I pushed for this program [at a faculty meeting]: TCGs were evaluation-free and completely voluntary" ; principal chose final mix of teachers (experienced and new teachers distributed across grade levels); principal only attended one meeting so as to not appear obtrusive; made arrangements for substitutes and chatted informally with teachers about gameplans; facilitator was new to school and TCG leadership was an incentive: as ILT, Mary had to demonstrate competence in helping teachers ("TCG made or broke her").

---

4) What implication did this TCG experience have for teacher work redesign?

[F] This group created an awareness of what is going on in other classrooms leading to personal change; two TCG members became co-facilitators in the next year's group (1990-91)

[T] TCGs provided communication (e.g., special education and regular teachers discussing common problems); facilitator influenced a collegial atmosphere throughout school (e.g., teachers beginning to plan together because they realized that the collaborative format was more efficient).

[P] "Teachers are becoming aware of total school picture and not just of their own classrooms" and now want to be involved in school-wide school improvement projects.

Franklin High School (1989-90)

Facilitator Leadership

Field Observation. Appendix F contains the data; a synopsis specific to Jessie's TCG leadership follows. Both TCG presenters stated their gameplans clearly and then linked their implementation attempts specifically to their gameplans. Both critiqued their gameplan implementations. Jessie was observed as task-oriented. Having distributed the TCG meeting format, she moved the presenters through the steps, yet exhibited a sensitivity to the complexities of the TCG process.

Survey Data. Jessie provided the technical assistance (questions 1-3) and obtained teacher agreement on structuring the meetings (although ratings were not as high as those of Mary's). Providing for a professional environment also was moderate (questions 7 and 9), while logistical support was slightly above average (question 8).

Perceptions of Facilitator Leadership. Table 3 contains these data.

Place Table 3 about here

TCG Outcomes. Based on survey questions 10 and 11, teachers always formulated gameplans and observed the collegial assessment (Step 4). Jessie kept them focused (consensus=F-R for all participants; ratio for gameplans= 7:1). The professional growth index was moderate (6.3 and represented the "midpoint" between the other two TCGs).

Table 3

Perceptions of Facilitator Leadership: FHS (1989-90)

What did this TCG facilitator do in exercising group leadership (or lack thereof)?

*[F] She quickly clarified her position ("This [TCG] is new to me so tell what you think I need to do"). She ensured that all presentations were important.

**[T] "Jessie guided us in our goals, offered suggestions, and [when off task] reminded us why we were there." Instead of a predetermined order of presentations, order depended on needs of presenters.

***[P] The TCG procedure was well outlined. Jessie had knowledge of subject matter and good inter-personal skills (resulting in give-and-take with colleagues).

---

* F= facilitator

** T= teacher interviewee

***P= principal

Analysis. Jessie kept the meeting structured and provided the technical support. Her logistical support also was slightly above average. Jessie's strength was in setting a professional environment: Teachers were observed as critiquing their gameplan attempts; collegial interaction was the group norm (participants determining presentation order; Jessie's modeling an awareness of the complexities in teaching; give-and-take between facilitator and colleagues). The TCG outcomes substantiate this success (especially in teachers formulating gameplans and observing collegial assessment--step 4).

Organization Mediation

Table 4 contains these data.

Place Table 4 about here

Analysis. Traditional teacher norms had no negative effect on Jessie's role (learner/guide/facilitator). She was respected as a colleague and trusted by TCG members. According to Jessie, the group perceived that the administration was treating them professionally (so reciprocity might have occurred). Organization mediation effects were analyzed as supportive, and included principal backing of TCG (especially his belief in shared decision making and his empowerment of Jessie to chose the TCG members), and the "good news" passed by TCG members on to other faculty members.

All three interviewees used the Gifted Education for Math and Science (GEMS) program to underscore the potential for TWR. The need for "teacher conversation" was perceived as a crucial piece in TWR, especially since the GEMS program was initiated after math and science teachers confronted a math-science curriculum misalignment..

Table 4

Perceptions of Organizational Mediation: FHS (1989-90)

---

1) How did you perceive the TCG facilitator's role?

[F] "The presenters accepted me as a learner and I felt assimilated [as part of the group]".

[T] Jessie was a guide and gave direction but was never intrusive.

[P] She was not autocratic but operated as a facilitator (here is the outline--how can we best implement it?).

---

2) How did traditional norms about teaching (equality, autonomy, privacy) mediate the TCG facilitator effectiveness?

[F] "We all saw ourselves as treated by professionals [by the administration]." "Also, presenters would ask me for input (for their gameplans as if I were a colleague, not a facilitator)."

[T] "We knew her beforehand and trusted her; we never thought she would divulge things to administration."

[P] Her personality was not authoritarian; she was respected for what she said (not on a power trip).

---

3) What school-wide structural factors (if any) mediated the TCG facilitator effectiveness?

[F] + [T] She was empowered by her principal (in his first year) to chose teachers from math and science. She asked for volunteers and then chose six teachers who had been there the longest (after clearing this selection with the other two teachers). Because this group succeeded, its members spread the good news throughout school

[P] "I am a believer in shared decision making (when appropriate), got substitutes far in advance, and choose the facilitator because I had an intuition that she'd do a good job." Principal attended at least two TCG meetings.

---

4) What implication did this TCG experience have for teacher work redesign?

[F] [P] + [T] mentioned the Gifted Education for Math and Science (GEMS). TWR can only work when release time can provide teacher conversations. Science teachers had complained that students "...could not do math." After assessing the curriculum the TCG members realized that certain skills were not being taught. The end product was GEMS: an interdisciplinary math-science curriculum for high-order thinking skills and a three-year state incentive grant (first year: $80,000). Jessie and this teacher were given extended day contract and an extra planning period for curriculum development (1991-92).

Leadership.

Field Observation. Appendix G contains the data; a synopsis specific to Jane's TCG leadership follows. This was the last scheduled TCG meeting and the facilitator asked members to summarize progress on their YLFs. Although several teachers acknowledged benefiting from their TCG experience, none of the six presenters was observed referring specifically to their MMGs in their summaries. Several teachers interrupted presenters. Jane did not ask any questions or comment on presentations.

Survey Data. Data from questions 1-3 maintain that Jane provided technical help. Data were mixed regarding provision of structure; she received only a 3.4 on Question 4 (insisting that participants follow the format). Jane received a low (3.4) in modeling expectations for instructional improvement and a 3.6 for providing logistical support.

Perceptions of Facilitator Leadership. Table 5 contains interview data.

Place Table 5 about here

TCG Outcomes. These data were inconsistent. Based on survey questions 10 and 11, teachers claimed they formulated MMGs and had moderate agreement on collegial assessment (step 4 of presentation process). Yet three of the four YLFs were analyzed as NF--"No focus", (although all YLFs were analyzed as R--"Reflective"). Gameplan ratio (6:2) and professional growth index (6) were lowest of the three TCGs.

Analysis. Jane's leadership behaviors were analyzed as ineffective. Survey data (questions 1-3) indicated that Jane provided technical assistance. In the TCG observation, however, Jane did not ask questions regarding any MMGs. Perhaps not coincidentally, presenters also did not refer to MMGs as they summarized progress

Table 5

Perceptions of Facilitator Leadership: FHS (1990-91)

What did this TCG facilitator do in exercising group leadership (or lack thereof)?

*[F] "I kept members on task as much as I could and modeled what they were expected to do [from my experience as a TCG member (1989-90)".

**[T] Jane's strength was "drawing out everyone by not dominating". Her weakness was that she did not always keep teachers on task [in one meeting members discussed and criticized administrative policy--of which Jane was particularly critical].

***[P] "I'm quite certain that it went well because I would have heard about it [from the members] had it not gone well." The facilitator leadership was a good opportunity for Jane since she is headed for an administrative position.

---

* F= facilitator

** T= teacher interviewee

***P= principal

made towards their YLFs. Jane also experienced difficulty in structuring the meetings (teacher interview; interruptions of presenters--field notes; and survey--especially question 4). Survey question 8 indicated little logistical support. Survey question 7 implied little setting of professional expectations by Jane (confirmed by field observation and Jane's interactions with the TCG members).

Outcome data were somewhat mixed but generally reflected the above data. Teachers claimed they formulated MMGs and had moderate agreement on TCG presentation step 4 (collegial assessment). Yet YLFs lacked scope (3 of 4=NF); and the gameplan ratio (6:2) and Professional Growth Index (6) were the lowest of the three groups.

Organization Mediation

Table 6 contains these data.

Place Table 6 about here

Analysis. Although Jane claimed her role was more of a TCG member than facilitator, the teacher interviewee perceived that Jane's lack of objectivity allowed certain presenters to dominate presentation time. (The principal was noncommittal--he had never observed this TCG). Traditional norms did not affect Jane's leadership (Jane: "I rarely had to exercise my authority") not because of Jane's influence but because of the tight sub-group norm set among the TCG members themselves. (Teacher interviewee: "When you share, you surrender autonomy and privacy to improve").

Table 6

Perceptions of Organizational Mediation: FHS (1990-91)

---

1) How did you perceive the TCG facilitator's role?

[F] "I did not have to provide much structure." She perceived herself more as a TCG member than a facilitator.

[T] "I had thought her role was to keep people on task." Sometimes other members appeared to fulfill her role. "Her personality was not right for the role. She was not 'objective' [allowing some people to dominate the time]".

[P] Authoritarian leadership was unnecessary because of the quality teachers involved in this TCG.

---

2) How did traditional norms about teaching (equality, autonomy, privacy) mediate the TCG facilitator effectiveness?

[F] This was not a problem because teachers were good friends of Jane's. "I rarely had to exercise authority. Teachers took over and handled it [TCG process]".

[T] "Once we saw the benefit [of TCGs], we were willing to critique and share; and, when you share, you surrender autonomy and privacy in order to improve."

[P] He was unaware of any problems with TCG norms.

---

3) What school-wide structural factors (if any) mediated the TCG facilitator effectiveness?

[F] The facilitator was selected by the principal because she was the only TCG member from the previous year who did not sign up for the GEMS program. "My previous experience [as a TCG member] helped sponsor this year's group; some teachers asked me about joining the group because they knew I had done it before."

[T] She perceived no negative factors. "We knew who the facilitator would be and all volunteered for the TCG." Jane was chosen because she wanted to do it. A positive factor was the school-wide impression that the previous year's TCG had gone well.

[P] The principal was unsure about how Jane was chosen but believed her previous experience was the reason. He had heard of no "problems" caused by the TCG.

---

4) What implication did this TCG experience have for teacher work redesign?

[F] FHS was beginning to adopt modified SBM (site-based management). Several SBM players were TCG members, who learned in the group that one could express opinions and not get fired if those opinions differed with administrator views.

[T] The TCG was a good way to begin TWR because this process opened communication among different department members.

[P] The principal did not have an opportunity to observe this group and therefore could make no implications for TWR.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Two possible organization mediation factors might have had a negative influence on this TCG. The principal was far less involved in this TCG than in the 1989-90 TCG. TCG members might have compared the principal's interest in this TCG with his two or three visits to the 1989-90 TCG and perceived less backing. Second, Jane apparently was chosen because she had participated in last year's TCG and because she saw this position as a good opportunity for administrative advancement. (According to the principal, she had administrator ambitions.). Jane also might have seen herself as "running the TCG" (hence the emphasis on consistent order of presenters), as opposed to understanding the importance of collegial interaction.

Generally this TCG was perceived as a good fore-runner to TWR: both as experience for group shared decision making and as opportunity for across-department communication.

Comparative Analysis of Findings

In this section study findings are compared across the three cases for each of the research questions.

Group Facilitator Leadership

Mary and Jessie were analyzed as providing effective leadership for their TCGs; Jane's leadership was analyzed as ineffective. Mary and Jessie provided more technical support (worksheets with updated MMGs; copies of meeting format; questions on complexities of teaching). Mary and Jessie experienced no difficulty in keeping members on task (following the format); Jane had considerable difficulty with on-task behaviors. Only Mary provided varied logistical support for her members. Mary and Jessie provided empathic, professional environments (spirit of inquiry; teacher self-critique); Jane was observed as rarely asking questions about the teaching and learning processes or generally interacting with the TCG members. TCG outcome data supported this analysis: The YLFs of Jane's group exhibited less scope, and their MMGs a lower appropriateness ratio and professional growth index than those of the other two TCGs.

Organization Mediation Effects

Traditional teacher norms (cordiality, privacy, autonomy) among TCG members were analyzed as having no negative effect on the facilitators' roles. Mary's title (ILT), logistical support, and setting an empathic, inquiring environment solidified her role (structure setter; then peer supporter). Jessie's respect and trust as a colleague (she was the science department chair) and the group perception that the administration trusted the teachers with the professional autonomy helped her role as learner/guide /facilitator. Jane's problems as facilitator apparently were not caused by traditional teacher norms. According to the teacher interviewee, teachers saw the benefits of the TCG process and surrendered their autonomy and privacy for the right to share classroom problems and possible solutions.

Organization mediation effects outside the TCG had supportive effects on Mary and Jessie's leadership. Mary's incentive to establish herself as "pro-teacher" in her first year at BPS, her principal's pushing for the program (particularly at a general faculty meeting), and the voluntary nature of the TCG were positive mediation effects. Principal support (empowerment of Jessie to chose the TCG members from the eight volunteers, two TCG observations, and his belief that teachers should share in decision making), the "good press" given by TCG members to other FHS teachers, and the voluntary nature of the TCG were mediational factors in the 1989 TCG at FHS.

Organization mediation effects on Jane's leadership were somewhat problematic. The "good news" about the 1989 TCG and the voluntary nature of the TCG were positive factors. Jane's possible motive (advancement to an administrative position) and the principal's failure to visit the group might have mediated the intentions of TCG members. These factors might have accounted for the setting of a less professional environment of this TCG, e.g., lower assessments of YLFs and MMGs; and no observable reference to MMGs.

What may have accounted for differences between Mary and Jessie's leadership, on the one hand, and Jane's, on the other, especially since Jessie and Jane had led successive TCGs in the same school? Mary had an extra incentive: her survival. In her first year at BPS, Mary made sure that the TCG facilitator experience would legitimize her ILT position. Only Mary, for instance, provided considerable logistical support.

Jessie's presence (respected and trusted as science department head) and collegial interactions (sensitivity to complexities of teaching) may have established her as a *prima inter pares* among her colleagues. Jessie had admitted she was new to a TCG and asked her colleagues to let her know what she needed to do. Jessie, for instance, did not insist on a consistent presentation order; colleagues sorted themselves out according to individual needs at each meeting.

Jane may have misunderstood her role as facilitator, especially given her administrative ambition. Jane had mentioned that she rarely had to exercise her authority (regarding structuring the TCG). Yet facilitating a TCG may be more a function of collegial influence than of power. When her behaviors are contrasted with those of Mary and Jessie, Jane did little to gain normative influence. In fact she was observed as having little interactions with her colleagues, other than "running" the TCG (i.e., informing colleagues who was next to present).

Mary and Jessie's facilitative behaviors may have been normative (relating to professional inquiry, critique, and personal growth). Blase (1990) used the theoretic work of Etzioni (1961; 1975) and Barnard (1938) to imply that normative, not coercive, behaviors result in "rights" to influence. Mary and Jane seemed to garner this influence largely through collegial interactions with their peers.

The traditional teacher norms of cordiality, privacy, and autonomy specified by Smylie and Denny (1990) and the social mediation discovered by Hart (1990) were not found in this study. Traditional teacher norms did not negatively affect facilitator

status or role; facilitators were not caught in the middle between being a colleague or supervisor. In both of the above studies, programs were mandated (either by union contract or state legislation) and the designed teacher leadership programs implemented school-wide. The three TCGs, conversely, consisted of teacher volunteers who then chose YLFs and MMGs with the help of their colleagues. These two circumstances make comparison with the Smylie and Denny and Hart studies difficult. Yet the teacher choice and responsibility advocated by Glickman (1990) may have been influential in these three TCGs not experiencing traditional norm and social mediation effects.

TCG Experience Implications on TWR for Instructional Supervisors

These case analyses indicate potential of these TCGs for teacher work redesign for three reasons. First, traditional teacher norms were analyzed as having little effect on facilitator leadership. As concluded above, these three facilitators were not perceived as "caught in the middle", i.e., between playing the conflicting roles of "administrator" and "colleague". Second, Mary and Jessie were able to exert considerable leadership influence on their TCGs. Third, each TCG demonstrated evidence of teacher-initiated responsibility towards school improvement. Two members from Mary's TCG became co-facilitators for the 1991-92 group; Jessie's TCG became the catalyst for revamping the math and science curriculum; and Jane's TCG produced two or three main players for FHS's site-based management team. These teachers did not appear satisfied with mere teaching responsibilities; they sought direct participation in school improvement. TCG facilitation appears a practical and workable role for teacher work redesign. With appropriate support and release time, these teachers can begin to enlarge their roles in encouraging reflection and teacher professional growth.

Teacher work redesign in general implies major role changes for both supervisors and teachers. For supervisors TWR may make their jobs less of a logistic

nightmare, e.g., district supervisory responsibility for observing 300 K-6 language arts teachers. Rather than working one-on-one (traditional supervision), supervisors might consider strategies encouraging teachers to seek and define non-teaching roles as peer supervisors. Instructional supervisors now are expected to provide opportunities for teacher reflection on the nature of teaching and learning (Glickman, 1990). They no longer are expected--clipboard in hand--merely to observe and evaluate teachers in classrooms. Supervisors now can be viewed as networkers encouraging teachers to end classroom isolation and autonomy in exchange for group responsibility and professional growth.

Supervisors as networkers can use TWR to transform the traditional teacher role into new roles, e.g., peer observers, site-based staff development experts, mentors, and vital school improvement players. These new teacher roles are interrelated to institutional mission setting. Schools can become revitalized, client-centered workplaces only if teachers long accustomed to isolation and classroom autonomy are provided the time to build opportunities for collegial interaction (Fullan, 1982). Teachers (and administrators) will need to identify the skills and knowledge they want their students to know--compared with what current graduates now know and can do. Supervisors must become even more entrepreneurial in garnering the time, support, and opportunity for teachers to engage each other in the nature of teaching and learning.

This fundamental change in teacher role will not be easy--as indicated by this study's TCG outcomes. Despite differences in facilitator leadership, MMG assessments for professional growth were relatively flat across cases (6.6, 6.3, 6.0). Gameplans did not exhibit a cohesive pattern of growth towards the YLF, nor did they become more challenging. Collegial interaction, in which these teachers purportedly engaged, cannot be necessarily equated with challenging reflection and long term growth. The lack of a technical culture, an analytic orientation, and a serious sharing and reflection (Lortie, cited by Fullan, 1982) characterizing the teaching profession

represent an embedded culture which a year's TCG experience can hardly dent. Gibboney (personal correspondence, March 1, 1992) confirmed this speculation: "One year is a very short time within which to change teaching behaviors and the implicit theories and values that guide these behaviors."

Several questions emerge for supervisors interested both in TWR and in starting similar "study groups," such as TCGs. How can supervisors network among teachers to help set new norms of critical reflection and professional growth? How can supervisors parley TWR into lessening demands on their own time? How can supervisors help create the *time* for teachers to begin enlarging their roles? Will the most effective supervisors (providing solutions to these questions) work themselves out of their jobs to mosaic patterns of TWR?

Appendix A

The TCG Meeting Format

TCGs share a premise with other teacher study groups: Teachers themselves are the best resource for professional change and growth. Study groups (often called "support groups") enable a school's teachers most committed to changing and improving their teaching opportunities to be learners of the teaching process. In the TCG format, each teacher formulates a year-long focus (YLF) for this series of meetings--usually 8-10 per year. Implementing cooperative learning groups, improving time management during the remedial reading block, and setting up learning stations are three examples of YLFs. Teachers are encouraged to set goals and develop achievable gameplans (MMGs). (An MMG is an incremental step listing strategies to be followed for two or three weeks to improve upon their year-long focus).

These teachers deliberate upon alternatives to established practices. Teachers become action researchers and try out their gameplans. At each TCG meeting teachers update group members on progress made on their MMGs established at the previous TCG meeting through group analysis, critique, and encouragement. This collegial interaction results in the formulation of another MMG to be tested out for the two or three weeks preceding the next meeting. As this cycle continues, teachers become analysts, problem-solvers, and informal researchers of their own teaching styles. Group members learn both from this cycle of experimentation with different instructional strategies and from each other through group interaction.

The meeting format consists of : 1) a colleague's critique of a journal article related to his/her YLF; 2) presentations by all TCG members on the success of their MMGs; and 3) a 30 minute block for debriefing and journal writing. Each teacher presented the three gameplan attempts in a six-step presentation process: 1) presenter statement of last meeting's gameplan; 2) peer observer's feedback; 3) presenter shares action research of gameplan implementation; 4) group assessment of progress towards achieving year-long focus; 5) presenter and colleagues' suggestions for the next meeting's gameplan; and 6) presenter selection of gameplan.

Appendix B

Teacher Collegial Group Survey and Results

For items (1-9) use these answer choices:

A, strongly agree; B, agree; C, neutral-no opinion;

D, disagree; and, E, strongly disagree.

Our facilitator:

1. encouraged TCG participants to provide the presenter with workable ideas for the next meeting's gameplan.

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
5	4.6	4.2

2. helped teachers, when necessary, differentiate the terms "year-long focus" and "gameplans."

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
5	4.4	4.6

3. reviewed the TCG format steps (a-f) at first meeting.

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
5	4.6	4.6

4. insisted that TCG participants follow the meeting format.

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
4.8	4.4	3.4

5. maintained the expectation that TCG participants would collect classroom information on how the gameplans worked out in the classrooms.

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
5	4	4.2

6. consistently structured TCG meetings to ensure that participants help presenters with the assessment step (see step #4 above).

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
4.7	4.2	4.2

7. modeled expectations that your TCG would emphasize teacher improvement in instruction and curriculum (and not unfocused discussion on school-wide problems/issues).

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
4.8	4.2	3.4

8. networked with other teachers and building-level administrators to provide resources (e.g., materials, teacher expertise, peer observation) for TCG participants.

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
4.8	3.6	3.6

9) provided a supportive, empathic environment within which TCG participants could discuss both their successful and unsuccessful gameplan implementations.

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
5	4.6	4.4

For items 10 and 11 use this code: 5: 100-80%;
4: 79-60; 3: 59-40; 2D: 39-20; and 1: 19-0:

10) Estimate the overall percentage of occasions when, after a TCG meeting, teachers had specific gameplans to test out in their classrooms.

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
5	5	4.8

11) Estimate the overall percentage of occasions when Step #4 (group assessment of presenter progress) was followed in your TCG.

BPS	FHS.90	FHS.91
4.7	5	4.2

Appendix C

Assessment of YLFs and MMGs

Berry Primary School

	F or NF and R or NR*	PCI**	A : I***
1****	NF/R	7	8 : 0
2	F/R	8	8 : 0
3	F/R	3	8 : 0
4	F/R	9	8 : 0
5	F/R	6	6 : 2
6	F/R	7	8 : 0
TOTALS	F/R	6.6	7 : 1

Franklin High School (1989-90)

	F or NF and R or NR	PCI	A : I
1	F/R	7	4 : 2
2	F/R	7	7 : 1
3	F/R	6	8 : 0
4	F/R	7	7 : 1
5	F/R	5	7 : 1
6	F/R	6	4 : 2
TOTALS	F/R	6.3	7 : 1

Franklin High School (1989-90)

	F or NF and R or NR	PCI	A : I
1	F/R	5	8 : 0
2	NF/R	6	6 : 2
3	NF/NR	7	6 : 2
4	NF/R	6	3 : 5
TOTALS	NF/R	6	6 : 2

*F = focus of YLF
NF =no focus
R = reflection implied in YLF
NR = no reflection

**PGI = Professional Growth Index
10-1 scale (10 highest)

***Ratio of "appropriate" MMGs to "inappropriate" MMGs

****TCG participant members

Appendix D

Interview Questions

1) How did you perceive the TCG facilitator's/your role (Smylie & Denny, 1990, citing March & Simon)?

2) How did traditional norms about teaching (equality, autonomy, privacy) mediate the TCG facilitator effectiveness? [Was the facilitator "caught between" being a teacher versus "someone different--responsible for teacher growth and improvement"? Where was there acceptance and resistance of facilitator's role (Hart, 1990)?]

3) What school-wide structural factors [e.g., initial organization and sponsoring of TCG; availability of substitutes; backing and support by principal; selection of facilitator and TCG members] mediated the TCG facilitator effectiveness (Smylie & Denny, 1990; Nicholson, 1984)?

4) What implications did this TCG experience have for teacher work redesign?

Appendix E

Field Observation at Berry Primary School (3/19/90).

This group met in a local restaurant conference room and consisted of six teachers and the facilitator. Mary appeared well organized; she distributed handouts containing all the participants' YLFs and updated MMGs, and was observed as briskly moving the meeting along to accommodate the presentation needs of the two participants observed. Mary was observed as using questions to cue participants that moving on to the next presentation step was appropriate. For instance, she asked Juanelli what her next gameplan might be--given her assessment of the curriculum unit. She asked several questions of the two presenters, e.g., regarding Pam's success in using imagery for first graders, and often appeared more of a colleague than group leader. Of the four TCGs observed [during 1989-90], teachers at Central Primary were observed as most closely following the format and procedure.

Two of the six teachers presented: Juanelli and Pam. Juanelli presented her gameplan (implementing and assessing a curriculum unit) related to YLF (developing and assessing a physical fitness program.) She and her colleagues assessed the unit. For the next MMG she decided to work with the students in developing individual plans on the two week unit goals.

Pam confessed that she had always been rather leery and frightened by developing in her first grade students creative writing skills. She had chosen student writing, however, as her YLF because of the growth opportunity provided by the TCG. She presented on her MMG (using brainstorming strategies and directed questioning to stimulate imagery as pre-writing activities). As she and colleagues assessed this gameplan, Pam realized that the next MMG should involve three specific books that the students could use as a basis for writing their own stories. She concluded that very often, directed questioning at the first grade level was not successful in stimulating the imagery necessary for pre-writing activities and therefore hoped that the books would be a better resource.

Mary carefully had reviewed the TCG meeting format with her group, and emphasized that the format and process should be followed. She updated YLFs and MMGs for each meeting (as handouts) so colleagues could assess each participant's progress.

Appendix F

Field Observation at Franklin High School (02/19/90).

This group met in a local church and consisted of the facilitator and six teachers, one of whom was absent at this meeting. Two teachers were observed making their presentations: Nettie and Melba. Both presenters were observed as following the presentation steps; they stated their MMGs and described their implementation attempts. Melba's YLF was to improve scientific literacy through comprehension and writing skills. In her presentation she discussed a formula involving a variety of activities meeting the YLF. This meeting's MMG examined how to integrate outside speakers in motivating students to understand the importance of being scientifically literate. Melba critiqued an outside speaker's lecture on chromosome mapping because there was little student input. With appropriate suggestions from colleagues, Melba formulated her next MMG to have students brainstorm possible questions to ask the next speaker. These questions would be integrated into curricular objectives.

Nettie discussed her MMG: students identified as peers helped others with homework problems. Nettie confessed that cooperative learning groups (CLGs) were more complex to implement than she had anticipated. One colleague suggested that Nettie consult a book on strategies for implementing cooperative learning groups. For her next MMG, Nettie would use these student groups in completing seatwork problems.

With both presenters Jessie interjected a comment during step #4 on the difficulty of instructional decision making, e.g., communicating to students the CLG rules. She was observed as being task oriented, e.g., following the TCG format, a copy of which she had distributed to TCG members. Several times she diplomatically suggested that it was time for the next step, e.g., how can we help Melba with her next gameplan? She was observed as communicating the expectation that participants would follow the format, but where appropriate, allow for individual differences and implementation of YLF.

Appendix G

Field Observation at Franklin High School (05/08/91)

Jane started the meeting and explained to the observer that they were going to summarize what each presenter had done.

Jane first called on Benida. Her YLF was improving student willingness to read and write in the advanced placement History class. Benida discovered that some of the books on the reading list were "awful" and a more varied list was needed. In improving on her YLF, Benida discovered peer teaching regarding the use of text. Students' responsibility was to share with others; this process made her job easier. Benida concluded that teaching was primarily an encouraging process, not an ordering process.

Carolyn then interrupted, "Is this [success with peer teaching] possibly related to students doing better in elective courses?" [since they presumably had interest in that subject since they signed up for it]. Benida countered that question with "I think the importance is giving students choices."

Tammy (the next presenter's) YLF had shifted to encouraging students to be curious. Tammy shared that she learned to be "sneaky". Papers and projects that she assigned were successful, and they improved the self confidence of her students. She observed that there was lots of excitement generated. Students actually talked about, for instance, a cancer conducive disease during lunch . She also observed considerable student initiative.

Shirley then interjected that too many projects at FHS were being assigned at the same time. "We need to look at this next year," and her comment engendered a brief discussion about which teachers were assigning what projects.

Harold, whose YLF was improving the self esteem of two special education students, shared that he had tried to get the students to accept responsibility. David had improved; he now asked for his homework. Apparently, he had decided to break away from Kevin who was an impossible task. Harold was stunned when he discovered that the father, whom he had cajoled into attending a parent conference, had the same negative attitude as Kevin. Harold then said, "You just can't change the home, especially after nine years [of interaction of father and son regarding the importance of school]."

Carolyn then said "Are there any motivators for Kevin?" Harold said, "No." Tammy said "What about taking the car away? Does he have any goals?" Harold said, "He wants to rob a bank by 20." Carolyn suggested, "What about having an outside speaker come in who is familiar with conditions of reform school?" Another question was asked, "Is he angry or mean?" Harold replied, "Just mean. Unfortunately, he's given everything he wants like a new car [by his father]."

Carolyn then deviated from Harold's presentation and shared a horrendous story about a kindergarten student [apparently with a similar negative attitude].

Shirley's YLF was parent involvement in their students' education. Shirley shared that she had gotten this idea from the group. She did not have enough evaluation data regarding whether this project actually worked.

Tammy interrupted and mentioned how Shirley had helped her by sharing a letter she sent home to parents. "I realized that I really was not contacting parents. Now, through this year I find myself calling parents, and I am

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

looking for opportunities to make contact."

Shirley continued, "I don't know how this particular letter to parents will work." She then agreed with Tammy: "By making an open, positive approach, we're seen less as a threat to parents. Parents are more threatened by us than vise versa." Benida suggested, "It might be helpful to send home a letter the first day [to initiate that positive approach]."

Penny's YLF was encouraging reading as a useful activity. She had some success in having students read National Geographic and Smithsonian. Shirley interjected that Penny had really helped her. "When I send out reading lessons, I now add newspapers, magazines, Sports Illustrated and so forth because it's more important to get them reading than necessarily what the subject is."

Penny continued, "I was getting discouraged with my remedial class. Now we go to the library and find articles and look up certain terms related to the subject we were talking about. So students look up these terms on their own." Students discovered interesting things to read about such as the preservation of Ivory and the importance of ecology.

Carolyn's YLF was improving student self confidence with mathematics by encouraging students to be self-starters and overcome the fear of Math. "Sometimes, I go through and explain the problems and do some on the board. Then I use the groups for students to help each other. Or I may start with a known topic and an entire group starts on problem solving and students get the same grade. If one student messes up, then that affects their entire grade. After some problems, I found that it was best to let the students choose their own groups [CLGs]. There would be one super student in each group and then others whom this student could help. CLGS reduces paper correcting because now there's only one third as many papers. Sometimes I hand a problem that I can't do to some of my best students."

Jane closed the meeting: "I've learned a lot from all of you. Now I tell students to look up the answers because I've already lectured on this particular material." Jane was observed as relaxed and more of a TCG member than facilitator in her non-verbal behaviors. She was not observed as entering into discussion on presentations. Instead she introduced the presenters.

References

Angus, L. (1988, April). School leadership and educational reform. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Barnard, C I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Blase, J. J. (1990). Some negative effects of principal's control-oriented and protective political behavior." American Educational Research Journal, 27, 727-753.

Bolin, F. S. (1989). Empowering leadership. Teachers College Record, 91(1), 81-96.

Bredeson, P. V. (1989, March). Redefining leadership and the roles of school principals: Responses to changes in the professional worklife of teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986), A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Author.

Clark, D. L., & Meloy, J. M. (1989). Renouncing bureaucracy: A democratic structure for leadership in schools. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. A. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reform to issues that count. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Corcoran, T. B. (1989). Restructuring education: A new vision at Hope Essential High School. In J. M. Rosow & R. Zager (Eds.), Allies in educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Elmore, R. F. (1979-80). Backward mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions. Political Science Quarterly, 94, 601-616.

Etzioni, A. (1961). A comparative analysis of complex organizations. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Etzioni, A. (1975). A comparative analysis of complex organizations (rev. ed.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

National Governors' Association (1986). Time for results. Washington, DC: Author.

Nicholson, N. (1984). A theory of work role transitions. Administrative Science Quarterly 29, 172-191.

Kelley, E.C. (1951). The Workshop Way of Learning. New York: Harper, Inc.

Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(1), 9-14.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Gage, N. L. (1989). The paradigm wars and their aftermath. Educational Researcher, 18(7), 4-10.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach, second edition. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for Qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Hart, A. W. (1990). Impacts of the school social unit on teacher authority during work redesign. American Educational Research Journal, 27, 503-532.

Heifetz, R. (1988, October). Face-to-face: Leadership expert Ronald Heifetz. INC., 10(10), 36-48.

Maccoby, M. (1988). A new model for leadership. Research Technology Management, 31(6), 53-54.

McCarthey, S. J., & Peterson, P. L. (1989, March). Teacher roles: Weaving new patterns in classroom practice and school organization. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Marshall, C. (1985). Appropriate criteria of trustworthiness and goodness for qualitative research on education organizations. Quality and Quantity, 19, 353-373.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moore-Johnson, S. (1988). Pursuing professional reform in Cincinnati. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 746-751.

Moore-Johnson, S. (1989, May). Teachers, power, and school change. Paper presented at the Conference on Choice and Control in American Education. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Murphy, J. (1990, October). Restructuring schools: Looking at the teaching-learning processes. Paper presented at the annual conference of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh.

Murphy, J. (1992). Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1989). The leadership needs for quality schooling. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.) Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count. Boston: Allyn & Bacon..

Smylie, M. A., & Denny, J. W. (1990). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 26, 235-259.

Weber, R. P. (1985). Basic content analysis. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Wise, A. (1988). The two conflicting trends in school reform: Legislated learning revisited. Phi Delta Kappan 69, 328-333.

Yin, R.K. (1984). Case study design: Design and methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.